DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 430 398 FL 025 833

AUTHOR Ingram, D. E.; O'Neill, Shirley
TITLE Cross-Cultural Attitudes as a Goal of Language Teaching in the Global Context.
PUB DATE 1999-04-18
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the RELC Regional Seminar on Language in the Global Context: Implications for the Language Classroom (Singapore, April 18-22, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Change; *Cross Cultural Training; *Cultural Awareness; Educational Objectives; Foreign Countries; Global Approach; Intercultural Communication; *International Education; *Second Language Instruction; *Second Languages; Secondary Education; Tables (Data); Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Australia (Queensland)

ABSTRACT

A central goal of language education in the global context is the fostering of favorable intercultural attitudes. Most language policies and syllabuses espouse improved cross-cultural understanding and more favorable cross-cultural attitudes as central goals. The report details a study conducted in Queensland (Australia) schools concerning the effect of language learning on cross-cultural attitudes and identifying variables in the language teaching/learning process that influence cross-cultural attitudes. Data were drawn from a survey of 598 grade 10 students concerning cross-cultural attitudes and a survey of 24 teachers concerning their values in language teaching. Results indicate a generally positive student attitude toward languages but do not show a correlation between language learning and language attitudes, only suggesting that student background variables may influence attitudes. The teaching methods and class activities favored by students were those felt to be conducive to favorable cross-cultural attitudes, but were low among teacher priorities. Extensive data tables are included. Contains 68 references. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

[Version without Appendices
(Questionnaires)]

ED 430 398

Cross-Cultural Attitudes as a Goal of Language Teaching in the Global Context

D. E. Ingram
Professor of Applied Linguistics,
Director, Centre for Applied Linguistics and Languages,
Griffith University,
Nathan, Brisbane, Queensland, 4111,
Australia

and

Shirley O'Neill
Senior Research Fellow,
Centre for Applied Linguistics and Languages,
Griffith University,
Nathan, Brisbane, Queensland, 4111,
Australia

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. E. Ingram
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper to the RELC Seminar 1999, *Language in the Global Context: Implications for the Language Classroom*, Regional Language Centre, Singapore, 18 – 22 April, 1999. Also to the Post-RELC Seminar, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand, 26 – 27 April, 1999.

FL 025833

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Cross-Cultural Attitudes as a Goal of Language Teaching in the Global Context

D. E. Ingram
Professor of Applied Linguistics,
Director, Centre for Applied Linguistics and Languages,
Griffith University,
Nathan, Brisbane, Queensland, 4111,
Australia

and

Shirley O'Neill
Senior Research Fellow,
Centre for Applied Linguistics and Languages,
Griffith University,
Nathan, Brisbane, Queensland, 4111,
Australia

Abstract

One of the central goals of language education in the global context is the fostering of favourable intercultural attitudes. As the world gets smaller, as communication and interaction between peoples of different races, cultures and language backgrounds increase, so the need for that interaction to be harmonious increases. Most language policies and language syllabuses espouse improved cross-cultural understanding and more favourable cross-cultural attitudes as central goals. Yet there are relatively few empirical studies that demonstrate the effect of language learning on cross-cultural attitudes or identify the variables in the language teaching/learning process that influence cross-cultural attitudes or that can be most effectively utilised to foster more favourable attitudes. This paper reports a pilot study in Queensland schools examining the relationship between language learning, cross-cultural attitudes, and elements of language teaching methods. The paper reviews the literature, outlines theoretical and empirical arguments, reports the results of the study, and draws conclusions for language policy and language teaching methods in the context of the role of language teaching in the process of globalisation.

The Presenters

David Ingram is Professor of Applied Linguistics and Director of the Centre for Applied Linguistics and Languages, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia. He is an Adjunct Fellow of the National Foreign Language Center, Washington DC and has published widely in such areas as language policy, language assessment and curriculum design. He was the Project Director for the study discussed in this paper.

Shirley O'Neill has been a Senior Research Fellow in the Centre for Applied Linguistics and Languages, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia, since 1998. Prior to that she spent some ten years as a senior research officer in Education Queensland, in which role she conducted and managed many small and large scale educational research projects for the Queensland Government.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the contribution of Kerry Townley-O'Neill, a language instructor in the Centre for Applied Linguistics and Languages, Griffith University, who acted as Research Officer on the project reported in this paper. The authors express their thanks to Education Queensland and the Principals of the State and non-State Schools where the survey was run for allowing the study to be undertaken in the schools in their charge.

Cross-Cultural Attitudes as a Goal of Language Teaching in the Global Context

D. E. Ingram and Shirley O'Neill

CONTENTS

I Introduction: an Enigma

II Research Overview

III Description of the Project

III.1 Project Aims

III.2 Method

Hypotheses

Project Design

Timing of the Study

The Subjects

Students

Teachers

Table 1: Characteristics of Students Surveyed

Table 2: Teacher Characteristics

The Questionnaires

Student Questionnaire

Teacher Questionnaire

IV Outcomes

IV.1 Adequacy of the Questionnaires

IV.2 Student Attitudes

Cross-Cultural Attitudes

Table 3: Overall Attitudes to other Cultures/Races amongst Year 10 Students
Table 4: Q6 Attitude to Speakers of Target Foreign Language
Table 5: Q7 Attitude to Australians
Table 6: Q8 (i) Attitude to Europeans
Table 7: Q8 (ii) Attitude to Asians
Table 8: Q8 (iii) Attitude to Australian Indigenous Persons
Table 9: Q9 Attitude to Language Teachers
Table 10: Q10 Attitude to Self

Perceptions of Classroom Practice

Students' Attitudes

Table 11: Q11. Percentage student response choices for classroom practice changes

Teachers' Responses

Table 12: Q2. Teachers' Priorities for Selected Goals of Language Education
Table 13: Q3. Percentage of Teachers by category of Frequency of Use of 22 Specified Teaching Activities
Table 14: Q2. Importance Teachers attach to nine factors in LOTE Course Design
Table 15: Q7. Teacher Ratings of the Proficiency of Year 10 Students

V Discussion and Implications

Subsequent Research

Role of Education

Foreign Language Teaching in the Primary School

Effects on Teachers

Teacher Education

Table 16: Extract from *Minimum Skills and Competencies Needed by LOTE Teachers*

Methodology

VI Conclusion

Bibliography

I INTRODUCTION: AN ENIGMA

This paper presents an enigma, an enigma that gets at the very heart of what language teaching claims to be about and that has to be solved if language teaching is to make its full contribution to globalisation. Most language teachers would agree that one of the central goals of language education in the global context is the fostering of favourable cross-cultural attitudes. As the world gets smaller, as communication and interaction between peoples of different races, cultures and language backgrounds increase, so the need for that interaction to be harmonious increases. Most language policies and language syllabuses espouse improved intercultural understanding and more favourable cross-cultural attitudes as central goals. Yet there are few empirical studies that conclusively demonstrate that language teaching has a positive effect on cross-cultural attitudes or identify the variables in the language teaching/learning process that influence cross-cultural attitudes or that can most effectively be manipulated to foster more favourable attitudes. This paper reports a pilot study in Queensland schools that sought to examine the relationship between language learning and cross-cultural attitudes, and sought to identify what elements of language teaching methods might have been factors in influencing those attitudes. If such a relationship and the determining elements of methodology could be demonstrated, then there would be clear implications for language policy and language teaching methods in the context of globalisation.

Yet, there is an enigma. On the one hand, language policy-makers and curriculum designers seem to believe that the fostering of cross-cultural understanding and more harmonious intercultural relationships are central goals for language teaching but, on the other hand, a review of the research literature reveals at least as many studies that point to no decisive cause-effect relationship or even a negative one.

On the one hand, there is the common belief among language teachers and applied linguists that one of their goals is improved cross-cultural understanding and more favourable attitudes. Wilkins, in reviewing some of the research into the cognitive, social and other psychological benefits of language learning, comments:

> *... we would like to know, for example, whether foreign language learning does raise the general level of language awareness, does help individuals to express emotional and moral attitudes, does assist individuals to gain control of their feelings. ... we would, for example, like to discover whether foreign language learning develops individuals' capacity to act as effective members of a social group. (Presumably the claim is that in learning a foreign language individuals become more socialised and better social beings in general and not just in relation to the particular social group that speaks the foreign language.)* [Wilkins 1987: 15]

A great deal of the immensely successful and influential work of the Council of Europe's modern languages projects grows from a belief that language teaching and learning favourably influence intercultural understanding and cross-cultural attitudes. While providing advice on the implementation of the Common European Framework of Reference, Trim identifies "mutual understanding and tolerance" as one of the challenges to life in the twenty-first century and comments:

The best protection against all forms of racism and xenophobia is provided by knowledge and direct experience of the foreign reality and improved life and communication skills. [Trim 1997a: 6]

In a 1998 agenda paper for the Board of the European Centre for Modern Languages, Trim also refers to the success of the modern foreign languages programme of the Council of Europe since it commenced in 1961, points to "the low levels of cross-cultural antipathy" shown by young Europeans, and concludes that "the primary objective of [Council of Europe] policy as set out in Recommendation R(82)18 of the Committee of Ministers is close to full achievement" [European Centre for Modern Languages 1998: 9]. Recommendation R(82)18 urges signatory states to implement its foreign language education policies which it justifies, in part, in asserting:

> *... that the aim of the Council of Europe is to achieve greater unity between its members ...*
>
> *.. that it is only through a better knowledge of European modern languages that it will be possible to facilitate communication and interaction among Europeans of different mother tongues in order to promote European mobility, mutual understanding and co-operation, and overcome prejudice and discrimination; ...* [Recommendation No. R(82) 18 of the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers]

Such a belief is reflected in many of the reports of the modern languages projects of the Council of Europe. The report of the Council's project "Language Learning for European Citizenship" re-states one of the aims of European language teaching as:

> *... - to build up mutual understanding and acceptance of cultural and linguistic diversity in a multilingual and multicultural Europe ...*
>
> *- to promote the personal development of the individual, with ... positive attitude towards other peoples and their cultures, free from prejudice, intolerance and xenophobia ...* [Trim 1997: 5 – 6]

Subsequently in reporting outcomes of the project, the report states:

> *Most of the* [workshop] *reports showed changes in learner and teacher roles and attitudes. ... Positive learner factors were: ... b) growing tolerance ...*[Trim 1997: 18]

The report urges "the promotion of large-scale plurilingualism" and states that modern foreign languages programmes should aim to develop in the learners

> *... their acceptance of and respect for the cultures of other peoples. This respect extends also to other communities and sections of society, both in other countries and their own. Acceptance should be based on knowledge, understanding and appreciation. This aim involves analysing and where appropriate questioning the learners' own culture as well as that of others.* [Trim 1997: 61 – 62]

The Council of Europe is not the only organisation that believes that language teaching can influence learners towards more favourable cross-cultural attitudes. The World Federation of Modern Language Teachers (FIPLV) cooperates with UNESCO which funds "Linguapax" workshops, the undoubted assumption of which is that language learning contributes to world peace through the fostering of better intercultural understanding and cross-cultural attitudes [cf. *FIPLV World News*, April 1995]. Workshop Number 5 was held in Australia in 1995 and called, *inter alia*, for

> *...language in education policies which aim at ... the development of the spirit of tolerance and the culture of peace.* [Cunningham and Candelier 1995: 14]

In Japan, a special interest group of the Japan Association for Language Teaching focuses on "Global Issues in Language Education" with a regular newsletter on issues of language teaching that contribute to world peace, essentially through the fostering of improved intercultural attitudes. Following the Melbourne Linguapax workshop in 1995, the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations established a similar special interest group to pursue Linguapax objectives.

Most national or state language policies and foreign language syllabuses are no less explicit in voicing a belief in the effectiveness of foreign language teaching in enhancing cross-cultural attitudes. One of the basic considerations in the 1998 advice of a "group of experts" mandated by the General Education Commission to develop a policy on the teaching of languages in Switzerland was that

> *La connaissance des langues voisines ou partenaire permet non seulement une* ***communication transfrontalière****, mais contribue aussi et surtout à une* ***compréhension mutuelle*** *et à une* ***attitude de tolérance*** *à l'égard d'autres cultures.*[1] [Conférence suisse des directeurs cantonaux de l'instruction publique 1998: 4]

In Britain, the 1990 National Curriculum stated as one of the aims of foreign language teaching:

> *... to offer insights into the culture and civilisation of the countries where the language is spoken ... to encourage positive attitudes to foreign language learning and to speakers of foreign languages and a sympathetic attitude to other cultures and civilisations.* [Secretary of State 1990, cited in Morgan 1993: 63]

In Australia, successive national policy statements have strongly endorsed the fostering of more favourable cross-cultural attitudes and intercultural understanding as goals for language teaching either in the context of Australia's multicultural society or in the global context as a pre-requisite to improved economic performance. The first national policy stated:

> *Since language and culture are inextricably linked, learning languages can contribute to cultural enrichment and intercultural understanding between members of different groups in several ways. ...*

[1] Emphases in the original text. In approximate translation: *Knowledge of neighbouring or partner languages allows not only communication across national borders but contributes also and especially to mutual understanding and an attitude of tolerance towards other cultures.*

> *... There is much to be gained for this country by promoting the teaching of the languages of our neighbours. ... This view of social, cultural and intellectual life in Australia provides a justification for second-language learning in the context of Australia's place in the world – a world characterized by a great need for tolerance and mutual understanding. Language learning has a role to play in this.* [Lo Bianco 1987: 45]

The Australian Language and Literacy Policy, adopted in 1991, accepted the view that

> *... language proficiency improves social cohesion, communication and understanding throughout the Australian community* [DEET 1991a: 62],

argued this as one of the justifications for an expanded second language teaching programme [Department of Employment, Education and Training 1991: 15], and argued that it

> *... can promote ... greater tolerance within the broader community of linguistic differences in Australia and internationally ...*[DEET 1991a: 63]

The complementary policy to the Australian Language and Literacy Policy is the National Asian Languages/Studies Strategy for Australian Schools. This policy is strongly oriented towards the role of languages in improving Australia's economic competitiveness and, in this context, it is no less certain as to the contribution of language teaching to improved cross-cultural attitudes and understanding. It notes the "general relationship between national linguistic skills and improved economic performance" [COAG 1994: vi] and goes on to observe

> *... the importance of minimising both the 'objective' and 'subjective' resistances to export growth ...*
>
> *the latter including both linguistic, cultural and attitudinal resistances ...* [COAG 1994: vi]

Elsewhere the report states that

> *The creation of an Australian "export culture" ... involves removing attitudinal and perceptional impediments to exports by equipping firms with future employees for whom the countries, languages and cultures of the region are not foreign but , in fact, familiar.* [COAG 1994: 2]

The report recommends a vast increase in the teaching of Asian languages (especially Chinese, Indonesian, Japanese, and Korean) and states:

> *... it is critical that Australia attaches the highest priority to the adoption and implementation of a long term strategy to ensure that the Australian workforce of the future is equipped with language skills, and associated skills of cultural awareness, of direct relevance to our national economic interest.* [COAG 1994: 14]

The foreign language syllabuses of the Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies all state as part of the justification for language teaching:

> *In addition, learning a second language widens horizons and leads ultimately to the capacity to look out from the new language and culture and, in effect, to develop a soundly based world view. This, in turn, fosters cross-cultural understanding and empathy with people of other languages and cultures whether they be members of the multicultural Australian society or from other countries.* [Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, Queensland 1995: 1]

II RESEARCH OVERVIEW

For most language teachers such views are so fundamental to their beliefs in their professional activity as to be unquestionable; yet, the literature is at best ambiguous on the effect of language teaching on cross-cultural attitudes and the empirical evidence is at best equivocal and sometimes contrary. Wilkins, reviewing some relevant research, concluded:

> .. *neither the empirical nor the theoretical research entitles us to make strong claims with regard to the possibility that the learner of a foreign language not only faces psychological demands* [of which he had earlier said there was little doubt] *but also gains psychological benefits* ...[Wilkins 1987: 32]

A lot of the literature that deals with attitudes is concerned with the effect of attitudes, empathy and different forms of motivation on language learning outcomes [e.g., Gardner 1985, Gardner and Lambert 1972, Horwitz and Horwitz 1977]. The focus in this present paper and of the empirical research study it will discuss is on the effect of language teaching or learning on the learners' cross-cultural attitudes.

Ingram, from 1975 onwards, presented comprehensive theoretical arguments related to the nature of language learning and personality development, and also adduced empirical evidence to argue that foreign language teaching could have a decisive impact on cross-cultural attitudes provided that it was properly structured to utilise active communicative methods and, in particular, incorporated "community involvement" or interaction with native speakers of the language in real-life situations as a central principle of syllabus design and methodology. He also argued that, in attempting to effect attitudinal change, it was highly desirable (indeed, probably indispensable) for the learners to exteriorise their intuitive responses and attitudes and subject them to rational consideration or "cerebration"; "community involvement" approaches enable learners to encounter native speakers as individuals within their own culture, they learn to see them as individuals with some features similar to their own as well as with cultural features that represent different views of the world and different ways of expressing similar needs and desires; "community involvement" approaches, it was argued, also enable teachers to take advantage of the "culture shock" that occurs in the course of students' initial interaction with other cultures in order to stimulate discussion on cultures, to try to explain and rationally change any of the students' adverse reactions and prejudices, and, in this way, to effect change in cross-cultural attitudes [see Ingram 1980, 1980a, 1980b, 1978, 1977, 1977a]. Ingram [1980b and 1980c] also provided empirical evidence that this approach could lead to changes in cross-cultural attitudes as reflected in students' responses to attitude questionnaires and demonstrated that, in a short "community involvement"

approach to the teaching of French at university level, significant changes in cross-cultural attitudes occurred both in attitudes to the target (French) culture and towards French speakers and to other cultures and people (including the Australian indigenous culture and peoples). However, this study was very small, used a very simple attitude questionnaire, and the course was developed and taught by Ingram himself (thus intruding a considerable Hawthorne Effect onto the study). Though the study was longitudinal with pre- and post-tests giving some indication of the effect of the course and methodological intervention, the problem remained of having learners responding according to their real feelings when they became strongly aware through the course of the researcher's own attitudes. In other words, while the theoretical arguments and the empirical study suggested a positive relationship between a certain type of language teaching and changes in learners' cross-cultural attitudes, the study had certain in-built limitations and there is need for the issue to be examined in more detail and on a much larger scale.

Other studies also claim to have found or argued for a favourable impact of language teaching and learning on cross-cultural attitudes. Riestra and Johnson [1964] had found that students studying Spanish had more favourable attitudes towards Spanish speakers than did those not studying Spanish though their attitudes to non-Spanish-speaking groups were no more favourable. Gardner and Smythe [1975] found that the more years were spent in studying a foreign language, the more favourable were the attitudes to the speakers of that language. Similarly, Bartley [1969, 1970] found that language dropouts had less positive attitudes than those who elected to study a foreign language in the following year, though what was the cause and what was the effect in this seems uncertain.

One of the most comprehensive reviews of the relationship between foreign language learning and attitude change is that by Morgan [1993]. Morgan reviewed largely British and American literature going back as early as 1932 though much of the research she considered came from outside language teaching. She draws attention to the fact that focussing directly on and discussing attitudes contributes to positive changes but she also warns that drawing students' attention to cultural problems may heighten anxiety levels, and, by implication, prompt the erection of defensive barriers. She notes that the "atmosphere" of a classroom where the teacher has tried, with posters and other realia, to re-create the atmosphere of the target culture bring beneficial effects but she does not take the implications of this further to emphasise the importance of "community involvement" as a means of ensuring learners actually experience that culture in interaction with native speakers in their home or work environments [Ingram 1978, 1979]. She reviews research on the effect of "externalising" issues for discussion and notes that longer term change is more likely to occur where affective reactions are complemented by "cognitive processing" in which learners identify and talk about their experiences and attitudes or, as Ingram termed it in his earlier writings, by 'cerebration" [e.g., Ingram 1978, 1980b]. In reviewing factors that make favourable attitude change more likely to occur, Morgan concludes:

> *What is clear..is that attitude change does not operate in isolation. In order for change to take place, some basic re–structuring on a cognitive level with probable shifts in affectivity must occur.* [Morgan 1993: 72]

Morgan also noted research that showed that role play, in which learners played the role of people in the target culture, was effective in having them understand the other

culture and develop more favourable attitudes towards members of that culture. It was important, however, that role play be conducted in a non-threatening manner and this may lend support to the view that community involvement in which learners interact with native speakers or their surrogates in real-life or realistic situations is most likely to be effective in fostering favourable cross-cultural attitude development when it is accompanied by considerable support from the teacher in preparing for the experience and, subsequently, in having learners talk about and come to understand what has occurred and their own reactions to it. She observes that

> *In order for students to appreciate and understand new cultures, it is crucial for them to identify and voice their present thoughts and feelings about that culture and about their own culture.* [Morgan 1993: 74]

Endorsing the notion that interaction or community involvement leading to the establishment of positive attitudes between students and native speakers is effective in improving attitudes, she states:

> *If some affective bond can be established within a language context between teacher or pupil or between people from different cultures ... then it seems likely that the necessary cognitive and affective changes will arrange themselves.* [Morgan 1993: 68]

Morgan notes that in teaching cultural understanding it is necessary to alert students to the schemata and beliefs of their own culture and so to make them aware of the relativity of this particular pattern amongst alternatives (including the target culture). She cites research which endorses the importance of the opportunity for learners to re-conceptualise their prior experience through the new language, as a result of, for example, field trips and other activities which allow them to talk about and re-conceptualise their home environment in the target language [cf. Ingram 1978 and 1979]. Reviewing the research, Morgan concludes:

> *Viewing the mother-culture through the eyes of the target culture can also be an enlightening experience...* [leading to attitude change]. [Morgan 1993: 72]

Others also have argued and, in some cases, demonstrated, that attitudinal change is possible in the classroom though it does not always occur in a favourable direction. An article in the *Washington Post*'s *Education Review* in April 1994 described how a teacher created negative attitudes in half her class towards people of different eye colour:

> *In 1968, Jane Elliott, a third grade teacher in Iowa, was trying to impart to her class a notion of the evils of discrimination. The class did not quite understand what she was discussing. She tried what she thought was going to be merely an educational game. She divided her class into two groups according to eye color and declared that brown–eyed people were unequivocally smarter, cleaner and more civilised than those with blue eyes. Blue–eyed children had to sit in the back of the class, were not allowed to use the water fountain and were not to speak unless spoken to. The game was to continue for two days, but Elliott felt she had to cut it short. "By the lunch hour," she recalled, "there was no need to think before identifying a child as blue– or brown–eyed. I could*

> *tell simply by looking at them. The brown-eyed children were happy, alert. The blue-eyed children were miserable. At this point, the class was ready to be told: Now you know what it feels like to be discriminated against."* [Etzioni 1994: 36].

Kramsch, in discussing the training of American businesspeople to interact more effectively with their foreign counterparts, notes that learning a language and learning to interact with other people leads one to better understand one's own identity, culture, and systems and to recognise that it is a particular system different from but no more justifiable or unjustifiable than any other culture. She says:

> *Teaching language as social practice means linking linguistic forms and social meanings ... learners must be willing to see the world from another perspective. Furthermore, learning a foreign language or going abroad is the first time that many American students are confronted with their "Americanness" ... Through the image they project to speakers of other languages and through those speakers' reactions, students may realize how American their own perspective is. ...*
>
> *...As American students learn to understand rather than to judge other peoples' ways of viewing the world, they can better appreciate their own perspective in its global, historical, and social context and accept that perspective as one among many possible expressions of modern society.* [Kramsch 1993: 8 – 9]

It seems, however, that learning to understand must come as a result, at least partly, of interaction and contact with speakers of the other language or with other cultures. Knowledge alone does not seem to favourably affect attitudes. Ingram [1978, 1980b] adduced evidence for this and argued that knowledge alone left the learner esconced in his or her own culture, looking out, often judgementally, at the other culture, observing its differences like walking through a museum. Jones [1996] reported on a study by the Australian Catholic University of more than 2,000 students in formal religious courses teaching about the different religions. The outcome was a worsening of attitudes and a conclusion that formal teaching about religion decreased tolerance and increased prejudice with those who had done more formal study showing the worst effects. In other words, there is no evidence, whether from the literature on language education or of social studies and religious education, that increased knowledge necessarily improves cross-cultural attitudes. On the other hand, Mantle-Bromley and Miller [1991] showed that in language classes that included "multicultural sensitivity lessons" more favourable attitudes were achieved than classes without such lessons [Mantle-Bromley and Miller 1991: 422 423].

Other studies have shown that the most important variables in determining cross-cultural attitudes are such "background variables" as common socioeconomic class, social attitudes and parental attitudes. Byram and Estarte-Sarries [1991] investigated the assumption that language learning broadens students' horizons and looked at the effect of French teaching on students' knowledge of and attitudes towards French people but concluded that the most important variable was the students' backgrounds; in particular, gender, membership of a particular school class, age and socioeconomic status were more significant than such variables as having foreign family friends, having parents or siblings who had learned another language, or the experience of visiting other countries.

Other studies again have argued or claim to have shown that interaction is the critical variable in determining whether an educational experience will have a favourable effect on cross-cultural attitudes. Ingram has argued at length that interaction with native speakers is a critical issue and, as noted earlier, a study of the effect of "community involvement" on the attitudes of university French students was very favourable [Ingram 1978, 1980b, 1980c]. Clement, Gardner and Smythe [1977] assessed the attitudes of Grade 8 anglophone students before and after a short trip to a francophone environment and found that the "high contact group" showed more positive attitudes towards both French people and language.

On the other hand, Mantle-Bromley and Miller [1991] cite studies, some of which claim to show that contact with the target language group improves the cross-cultural attitudes of learners with the frequency of that contact being significant while others claim to show that "bicultural exchanges" did not achieve significant attitudinal change [Mantle-Bromley and Miller 1991: 418 - 419]. Similarly, Byram and Estate-Sarries [1991], as already noted, found that the experience of visiting other countries was less significant in determining attitudes than "background variables". Indeed, one might well point to the many conflict situations around the globe in which different ethnic groups have frequent interaction with each other, sometimes with extremely negative attitudinal outcomes. Jaspers and Hewstone [1983] conclude that interaction does not, of itself, reduce inter-group tension or improve relations but only when certain other conditions are satisfied including that there is equal-status interaction, when the contact is between members of the majority group and higher-status individuals in a minority group, when an "authority" and/or the social climate are in favour of such inter-group contact, when the contact is close rather than casual, when the contact is pleasant and rewarding, and when the members of the different groups interact in functionally important activities and develop common goals [Jaspers and Hewstone 1983: 127 - 128]. Wilkins also quotes a number of studies, mainly related to French immersion schemes in Canada, from which he endorses Genesee's conclusion that

> *There may be limits to the extent of attitude change that can be achieved in second language programmes which do not provide real meaningful contact between the learner and members of the target language group*

and that

> *bilingualism through schooling alone may not be sufficient to effect unlimited social psychological change.* [Genesee 1983: 37, 39 cited in Wilkins 1987: 23]

Clearly such conclusions have serious implications for language teaching designed to effect favourable attitudinal change by encouraging interaction with speakers of the language.

Most challenging to the belief that language teaching will favourably influence the direction of cross-cultural attitudes are the studies that claim to show that language classes actually create less favourable attitudes. Mantle-Bromley and Miller [1991] cite a number of studies that show this adverse effect and, in their own study, attitudes became less favourable during the first semester of a language class. They suggest that the cause of this more negative attitude may have been that some of the students had been compelled against their wishes to take the language class and that many of the students found

language learning to be more difficult and good results harder to achieve than they had anticipated [Mantle-Bromley and Miller 1991: 422 – 423]. Later, Mantle-Bromley sought to replicate this earlier study and again concluded that

> *... students' attitudes do not (as we might hope) become more positive merely by being in the language class. Mounting evidence suggests, in fact, that without teacher intervention, students become not more, but less positive about other languages and cultures after initial exposure to language study ...* [Mantle-Bromley 1995 : 378].

However, Mantle-Bromley did conclude from her study that, if there was appropriate intervention by the teacher, a decisive improvement in cross-cultural attitudes could be achieved. Significantly, this intervention took the form of discussions about attitudes (including lessons that showed that certain attitudes and stereotypes were not supported by the evidence), direct exposure to the other culture (in this case, in a fairly simplistic form through letters from penfriends and slides of a country where the language is spoken), discussion of the importance of intercultural understanding, and lessons which encouraged students to understand what caused and maintained their own attitudes [Mantle-Bromley 1995: 377 – 378]. In other words, language teaching or learning alone does not seem to have a favourable effect on cross-cultural attitudes, the effect may indeed be negative if negative attitudes generalise from an unpleasant language learning experience, but a language teaching programme can be structured to promote more favourable attitudes with, as noted earlier in referring to Ingram's studies, certain factors being critical, especially interaction, the exteriorisation of intuitive responses, subjecting attitudes to rational examination, and "cerebration" [Ingram 1978, 1980b, 1980c].

In brief, despite the strong belief that language teachers, policy-makers and syllabus writers have in the beneficial effects of language teaching on students' cross-cultural attitudes, the evidence for or against this view is far from definitive. For this reason, it had been proposed to undertake a major study of cross-cultural attitudes in Australian schools, to trace attitudinal change through the school years, to endeavour to see whether involvement in foreign language learning was an influential factor in cross-cultural attitudes, whether it was favourable or unfavourable in its influence, and whether duration of the programme, methodology and proficiency levels attained were also related in some significant way to attitudes. The present study, with extremely limited funding, was designed as a pilot to check whether the survey instruments were valid and informative and to see whether, in a one-off attitude survey, it was possible to get any useful information about attitudes in Australian schools and whether it was possible to identify any relationship between students' attitudes and their language learning experience. In fact, as limited as the study was and as strongly as certain social factors may have influenced the outcome, it does seem to provide useful information on cross-cultural attitudes as well as on other teacher and student attitudes and values in relation to language learning. In this paper, however, the focus will, principally, be on cross-cultural attitudes with other matters considered in subsequent papers.

III DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

III.1 Project Aims: The specific aims of the project were to

- review the literature on cross-cultural attitude change and language learning;
- develop and trial cross-cultural attitude assessment instruments;
- identify what effect, if any, foreign language learning has on learners' cross-cultural attitudes;
- identify the variables in language learning and teaching that influence cross-cultural attitudes (e.g., duration of learning, the language learned, proficiency level attained);
- identify the variables in language syllabus design and methodology that can be controlled to favourably influence learners' cross-cultural attitudes;
- assess whether there is any link between what teachers value and students' cross-cultural attitudes;
- assess whether personal and social background variables (such as socioeconomic class or home language) affect attitudes and override any influence from language programmes;
- make recommendations for syllabus design and methodology in order to favourably influence learners' cross-cultural attitude development;
- conduct a pilot study that might feed into a bid for a major research grant permitting a more detailed longitudinal study; and
- accumulate any other informative data on language teaching and learning in Queensland schools.

III.2 Method:

Hypotheses: Though the study raises many issues that can be explored, some at least of which will be addressed in subsequent papers, the central hypotheses tested in this *study* are these:

Experimental Hypothesis 1: That the responses to a cross-cultural attitude survey of students currently studying a foreign language will be significantly more positive than those of students who are not currently studying a foreign language (probability preset, *a priori*, at .05).

Null Hypothesis 1: That there is no difference in cross-cultural attitudes as reflected in survey responses between those currently studying and those not currently studying a foreign language.

Experimental Hypothesis 2: That the responses to a cross-cultural attitude survey of students who have studied a foreign language for four or more years will be significantly more positive than those of students who have studied a foreign language for less than four years (probability preset, *a priori*, at 0.05).

Null Hypothesis 2: That the responses to a cross-cultural attitude survey of students who have studied a foreign language for four or more years will show no significant difference from the responses of students who have studied a foreign language for less than four years.

Project Design: The original design of the pilot project became severely curtailed when the funding allocation was announced and was barely sufficient to employ a research assistant for three months. The main effects of the limited funding were, first, to preclude the development of new attitude measurement instruments, making it necessary to adapt existing attitude questionnaires, and, second, to restrict the project to a single survey of the cross-cultural attitudes of Year 10 students. Consequently, the project took the following form:

1. A review of the literature on the role of language teaching in effecting changes in cross-cultural attitudes

2. Adaptation of questionnaires designed to elicit subjects' cross-cultural attitudes

3. A small pilot survey to test the comprehensibility and manageability of the survey instrument with Year 9 and 10 students

4. Development of a short teacher questionnaire to elicit information on teacher values in language teaching programmes

5. Selection of schools to be included in the survey in order to provide a spread of languages, durations of language learning, school types and probable socioeconomic classes

6. Data collection in the schools using a set of attitude questionnaires with Year 10 students and an information questionnaire with their teachers

7. Analysis of the results

8. Preparation of the report.

Timing of the Study: The funding for the study was received at the beginning of 1998 and the attitude survey undertaken in the first semester of 1998. The timing was both unfortunate and significant to the project in that, at the time the project was running, the election of a controversial Federal member of Parliament, Pauline Hanson, had not long occurred, a noisy public debate on the merits of immigration was in full swing, a debate which, in the eyes of many people, became a nasty debate on issues of racism, the merits of Asian (and other) migration to Australia, and funding to Australian indigenous persons. In reality, the emergence of the Hanson debate and the inappropriately named "One Nation" party was both surprising and aberrant in the history of Australian multiculturalism over recent decades and the demonstrated ability of the Australian population and culture to harmoniously accommodate large numbers of migrants of all origins. In fact, a number of issues quite unrelated to multiculturalism and racial or cultural attitudes helped to fuel the debate, such issues as general political disenchantment

and antagonism in the bush (though much less in the cities) to recently introduced and gun-control laws.

There is now strong evidence that the so-called Hanson-phenomenon will be short-lived: Hanson was heavily defeated electorally after one parliamentary term and electoral support for her party has dropped off dramatically from a peak in Queensland of some 25% to approximately 5% now. In addition, the survey that provided the attitudinal data for this project was conducted only in schools in Brisbane where support for "One Nation" was much lower than in the country, but, nevertheless, at the time that the survey was conducted, the debate was at its height and was a frequent topic of public discussion in the press and media and on talk-back radio. Obviously, such events are highly significant to the project because of the relevance of the "One Nation" debate to issues of cross-cultural attitudes, the evidence from some of the research already referred to that background variables may more strongly influence students' cross-cultural attitudes than anything that goes on in language classrooms, and the probability that the debate and feelings present in the community at large would have influenced the attitudes of the students and their responses. This influence was reflected also in the fact observed by the research assistant administering the questionnaire that students seemed to become increasingly reticent about expressing their attitudes as the period through which the questionnaire was administered in different schools (about three months from the first to the last school) wore on and a State election approached.

The Subjects: The main subjects were 598[2] Year 10 ***students*** in 7 State and 10 non-State secondary schools in and around Brisbane in South East Queensland. The students and their schools were chosen to provide a cross-section of socioeconomic classes, a range of languages, and a range of language learning experiences.

Though it had been hoped to be able to include both students who had learned a language over different periods and those who had not, it turned out that almost all the students had spent some time in language classes even though approximately 40% were not currently studying a language. Delays in obtaining approval from Education Queensland (the State Government Department that runs the State School system) to conduct the survey in State schools meant that the proportion of non-State schools in the survey had to be increased slightly to enable the survey to be completed in reasonable time: the final distribution was 7 State High Schools and 10 non-State Secondary Schools.

A total of 598 students answered the questionnaire in whole or in part. Of these, 57% (338) were female and 43% (255) were male (five did not answer the question). Most were aged 14 or 15 (568 or 95%). Most of the students were native English speakers with English the language spoken at home (87%) but another 25 languages were also spoken at home, the most frequent of which were a Chinese language (5.5%) and Hindi (1%). Almost half the students had learned or were learning Japanese with the next most frequent languages being French and German. These figures are shown in Table 1.

The ***teachers'*** numbers (24) were too few to provide statistically significant analyses or correlations with the student responses and their data is used mainly for descriptive purposes. These 24 teachers taught in 7 State High Schools and 10 non-State Secondary

[2] Sometimes students failed to answer particular questions and so, in the report that follows, numbers do not always add up to exactly 598.

Schools in Brisbane. Half (12) of the teachers taught Japanese, 4 were teachers of French, 3 of German, two of Indonesian, 1 of Italian and 1 of Chinese. 65% (15) of the 23 teachers who indicated their teaching experience had taught for 8 years or more. 12 (52%) had lived and worked for one year or more overseas but 11 (48%) had no overseas experience. This information is shown in Table 2.

Table 1: Characteristics of Students Surveyed

Total Student Numbers					Male		Female	Did not answer
598					255 (43%)		338 (57%)	5 (1%)
AGE								
13 years		14 years			15 years		16 years	17 years
3 (0.5%)		280 (47%)			288 (48%)		20 (3%)	1 (0.2%)
LANGUAGES SPOKEN AT HOME								
English		A Chinese Language			Hindu		Others	
87%		4.5%			1%		7%	
LANGUAGE LEARNING STATUS								
Total No. of students answering item		Currently studying a language			Not currently studying a language			Never studied a language
593		354 (60%)			230 (39%)			9 (1.5%)
Languages currently studied					Languages previously studied			
Jp.	Fre.	Ger.	Ch.	Other	Jp	Ger	Fr	Other
156	77	68	12	41	156	63	30	19
DURATION OF LANGUAGE STUDY								
4 or more years					Less than 4 years			
73%					27%			

Table 2: Teacher Characteristics

TEACHERS		SCHOOLS WHERE TEACHERS ARE TEACHING						
Tot. of Teachers		State High Schools				Non-State Secondary Schools		
24		7				10		
NUMBER OF TEACHERS PER LANGUAGES TAUGHT								
Tot. of Teachers		Jp.	Fre.	Ger.	Indon.	Italian	Chin.	No Ans
24		12	4	3	2	1	1	1
TEACHERS' TEACHING EXPERIENCE								
Tchers	Loc.	0 years	1 year	2-3 yrs	4-5 yrs	6-7 yrs	8-8+ yrs	No Ans
24	Aust.	0	1	3	2	2	15	1
24	O'seas	11	6	2	1(Not t[E])	1	2	1

The Questionnaires[3]: As already noted, because of the limited funding for the project, the original intention to develop and validate attitude survey instruments (questionnaires) specifically for the project was not feasible and the researchers borrowed and heavily adapted other instruments that had been used elsewhere and been proven to be useful. The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery was used and/or validated in a number of the studies referred to in the earlier literature survey [e.g. Gardner 1985a, Gardner and MacIntyre

[3] Because of their length, the questionnaires are not presented with this paper but are available on request from the authors.

1993, Mantle-Bromley and Miller 1991, Mantle-Bromley 1995] and the Ingram had developed and used successfully a much simpler set of questions in the context of his earlier research [Ingram 1980c]. The AMTB was not entirely suitable because it was considered too long for use with the target age group. Consequently, the researchers considered a number of existing survey instruments and modified them to better suit the project's aims and subjects. The student questionnaire was then briefly trialled with Year 9 and 10 students who were not to be included in the main project so as to check that the questions were comprehensible and that the questionnaire, though quite long, was manageable by students at or below the target age group. In this brief trial, the student questionnaire performed satisfactorily and its reliability was confirmed by statistical evaluation during the analysis of the survey results. Although students were free to ask for anything on the questionnaire to be explained, apart from an occasional question about the meaning of a word, the research assistant conducting the survey reported no apparent difficulty on the part of the students in interpreting and responding to most of the questions (the only one that caused significant difficulty was Question 1n, in which quite a few students seemed to have no idea of the level of their family income).

The ***student questionnaire*** contained eleven questions, each with a number of different component questions. They are a mixture of Likert Scale and other types and, in two questions, a "Neutral" box was provided, set off to one side in order to minimise the centralising tendency that exists as respondents answer such questionnaires. Most of the question sets contain distractor items to minimise automatic answering and to broaden the students' focus beyond the (necessary) attention given to attitudinal issues. Question 1 mainly sought personal information about the students such as that shown in Table 1 above. Question 2 used Likert Scale items to elicit the students' attitudes to the learning of languages. Question 3 asked students to respond to common statements relevant to language learning and, especially, attitudes to migrants, other cultures and Australian multiculturalism. Question 4 was the least successful statistically, and, except for Item e, was largely a set of distractor questions about their language classes and their learning strategies. Question 5 focussed on learning activities with the main interest for this study being on Item g. This question was also intended as a check on the teacher's responses to the teacher questionnaire to see whether students had the same perspective of what was being done in class as the teachers stated. Questions 6 to 10 used an identical set of semantic differential scales to elicit the students' attitudes to speakers of the language they are learning, to their fellow Australians, to Europeans, to Asians, to Australian indigenous peoples (i.e., Australian Aboriginals), to their language teachers, and to themselves. Question 11 was partly put in as a distractor but also in order to identify things that the students would like to see changed in their language classes. Together with Question 5, it reflects the students' preferred learning activities. Again, this question proved to be interesting in terms of the activities believed to influence cross-cultural attitude development, the extent to which students valued such activities, and, when compared with the teacher questionnaires, the extent to which the teacher's values used in determining activities matched the students' preferred activities.[4]

The ***teacher questionnaire*** contained seven questions designed to elicit their values and teaching activities and to give some indication of the attainments of students at Year 10

[4] It should be noted that the six options of the Likert-type scales in the questionnaire have, for the purpose of this report, been collapsed in the analyses into positive-negative. The principal reason for this, apart from providing an initial overview, was that the differences between groups were slight but it seemed informative to try to identify possible trends.

level. Question 1 sought information on the language taught and their years of experience. Question 2 sought information on the language teaching goals that the teachers most valued while Question 3 asked them to list the typical activities used in their language classes. Question 4 asked the teachers to indicate assessment itemtypes that they commonly used and gave them an opportunity to list others. Question 5 sought the names of the textbooks that were being used since this, like Question 4 on assessment types, was believed to give an indication of the sort of teaching methods preferred and the goals pursued. Question 6 asked the teachers to rate the importance of some nine factors that might influence the design of work programmes but also included items focussing on the extent to which the teachers encourage students to interact with speakers of the language, a factor considered in some of the literature to be important in effecting favourable attitude change. Question 7 asked the teachers to rate the typical proficiency level achieved by Year 10 students.

IV OUTCOMES

IV.1 Adequacy of the Questionnaires: As already noted, the student questionnaire proved to be reasonably satisfactory, the questions and their wording caused no significant problems, and the questionnaire proved to be statistically reliable with figures between 0.84 and 0.92 for Questions 6 to 10. Question 11 was lower (0.64) undoubtedly because of the ambiguity over the "no" and "no change" options. The problems that were identified will be addressed should funding be received for a major study in future.

The number of students was ample to yield statistically reliable results though one might argue that the State/non-State distribution of schools gave a higher representation to non-State schools than was warranted and that this might have somewhat distorted the socioeconomic class representation with possible implications for attitudes (though in what direction is far from clear).

IV.2 Student Attitudes: ***Cross-cultural Attitudes:*** The main purpose of the study was to examine students' cross-cultural attitudes. In particular, the aim was to establish whether students studying a foreign language for more or for less than 4 years had more or less favourable cross-cultural attitudes and whether those in a language programme had more or less favourable attitudes than those not in such a programme. Note, again, that the number of students who had not experienced language learning at all was only 9 (1.52%) out of 593 responding students and so no reliable comparison could be made between their attitudes and those of other groups within the student cohort. Table 3 summarises the results[5].

Overall, attitudes of Year 10 students to other cultural groups are quite favourable, certainly more positive than negative, and there was no significant difference in attitudes whether students were in a foreign language programme or not and whether they had learned the language for less than 4 years or more (the lack of significance being confirmed by *t-tests* of independent samples). However, when one looks more closely at the tables, some tendencies do appear but with such mixed results that it is difficult to

[5] Note that in all the tables, the numbers and percentages for those who are either in or not in foreign language classes relate to the whole cohort (see Table 1) whereas the numbers and percentages for those "Learning a Foreign Language for less than 4 years or 4 years or more" relate to those who are currently studying a foreign language (354, see Table 1).

conclude whether foreign language learning has had a positive or a negative effect on the students' attitudes. On the one hand, there is a tendency (just 4%) for those in the foreign language programme to be more favourably inclined towards the target language group than those who had dropped the subject (mostly eighteen months earlier at the end of Year 8). On the other hand, those who have been learning the language for less than 4 years show a very slight tendency (2.88%) to be more favourably disposed to the target language group than those who have been learning the language for 4 or more years. Their attitudes to Australians are virtually indistinguishable, as are attitudes to Europeans, except that those who have studied languages for more than 4 years have responded slightly less favourably. It should perhaps be recalled from Table 1 that about half of the students are in Asian language programmes.

Table 3: Overall Attitudes to other Cultures/Races amongst Year 10 Students

Cult. Group	L^E FL < 4 yrs	L^E FL =/> 4 yrs	FL in 1998	Not FL in '98
1. Target FL	78.44	75.56	78.063	73.813
2. Australians	79.38	81.44	81.063	81.313
3. Europeans	79.44	75.5	80.063	81.375
4. Asians	71.13	66	68.438	65.5
5. Aus. Indigenous	51.75	53.56	53.375	55.5
6. Lang. Teachers	77.56	73.81	75.938	68.38
7. Self	87.75	86.75	86.13	88.313
Attitude to other Cult. Groups (av. of 1, 3, 4, 5)	70.19	67.66	69.98	69.05

(To calculate the figures in Table 3, the percentage of students giving positive responses was calculated for each item in each question and the average of all the items in each question calculated to give a measure of the overall picture that emerges from the complex of attitudes to that particular cultural group as manifested in each item-response.)

The striking thing about the next two lines in Table 3 (Asians and Aboriginals/Australian Indigenous persons) and Tables 7 and 8 is that the scores for attitudes towards Asians are considerably and significantly lower than for Europeans and the target foreign language group and those towards Australian Indigenous persons are the lowest of all. Again, it is noticeable that attitudes of those who have studied a language for less than 4 years are slightly more positive towards Asians (by just over 5%) than are those of students who have studied the language for 4 or more years (and, again, one has to remember that about half of the students were studying or had studied Asian languages). This again makes one question the hypothesis that language learning will produce more favourable cross-cultural attitudes. The fact that attitudes to Asians are lower than towards Europeans even though half the students were in Asian language classes also suggests that other factors, background variables, were influencing the students' attitudes more than the language teaching they were experiencing.

It is of interest to note that attitudes to language teachers (Table 9) are slightly more favourable (just under 4%) amongst those who have studied a language for less than four years than for those who have studied it for four or more years. A greater and significant difference was found between those no longer in a language programme (most had dropped it about eighteen months earlier) and those currently in a language programme, the latter yielding a score just over 7% more positive, (the difference being significant at

the $p<.05$ level). When these attitudes are related to findings discussed later in relation to changes students want to see in their language programmes and what teachers value, one has to surmise that students' perceptions of their teachers may be a factor in whether or not they continue with language study. Nevertheless, overall attitudes to language teachers by all groups are quite positive (certainly considerably more positive than negative) and most similar overall to that towards Asians.

Overall, one has to conclude that attitudes to other cultural groups are generally reasonably positive (certainly more positive than negative) though attitudes to Australian Indigenous persons are less favourable than to Asians, the target foreign language group, Europeans, and Australians (in that increasing order though the attitudes towards Europeans and Australians are practically indistinguishable except for those who have studied a language for more than 4 years and whose attitudes are about 6% more favourable to Australians than to Europeans). In brief, there is no evidence to support the hypotheses that those in language programmes or those who have studied the language longer will have significantly more favourable cross-cultural attitudes than those who are not in a foreign language programme or who have studied the language for a shorter time.

However, a more detailed study of attitudes as revealed by the items in each question (Tables 4 to 10) suggests that background variables, including especially the public discussion surrounding "One Nation" and Pauline Hanson, had some influence on student attitudes. The following observations are notable:

1. The image presented of Asians by the racist propaganda at the time of the One Nation and Hanson debate suggested that Asian immigrants were unwilling to integrate into Australian society, though it was not disputed that they worked hard, many brought substantial sums for investment as business migrants, and they did well in school and business, the propaganda often suggested that they stayed in their own groups rather than integrate with Australians, and that much of their wealth was repatriated to their country of origin. These false views, much trumpeted by One Nation supporters, seem reflected in the students' assessment (Table 7) that Asians have a relatively high level of prejudice, are secretive, and are different from Australians, being rated as much less handsome, friendly, or honest though they were also perceived as harder working than Australians and about as successful as them. It is also highly significant, and undoubtedly a reflection of the One Nation debate, that Australians were rated by the students as very prejudiced and more so than any of the other groups. It is perhaps significant that the persons they saw as least prejudiced were, first, their language teachers and then themselves.

2. The students' self-esteem seems to be high (Table 10), with very positive attitudes towards themselves as reflected in scores for Question 10 significantly more positive than for other groups. It is curious, however, that those studying a language in Year 10 and those who have studied a language for 4 or more years believe themselves not to be as clever as do the other two student groups though their self-rating reflects attitudes little different from those towards the other cultural groups (except for the Australian Indigenous group which is rated very low on this criterion). In fact, it is commonly believed in Australia and confirmed by figures quoted to the LOTE Subject Advisory Committee of the Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies that students who continue with language

studies tend to be more able. One might surmise that excessive emphasis on formal accuracy (it is significant, as noted later, that grammar exercises and formal grammar teaching were rated very high by the teachers) and the struggle to communicate with limited resources convinces language students that they are not very clever.

3. In this study, it is difficult to sustain the hypothesis that language learning *per se* significantly fosters favourable cross-cultural attitudes or that it does so in any way that overrides other experiences or background variables. Though the attitudes of students who have been in language programmes for 4 or more years are not significantly different from those of the other three groups in Tables 3 to 10, if one considers the "overall" rating in Table 3, there is a tendency for students who have studied a foreign language for 4 or more years to have slightly less positive cross-cultural attitudes. Though the difference is slight, one can at least conclude that the evidence does not exist to say that language learning itself produces significantly more positive attitudes.

Table 4: Q6. Attitude to Speakers of Target Foreign Language
(Percentage of students giving positive ratings)

Positive to Negative Continuum		Students studying FL < 4 years	Students studying FL = or > 4 years	Students studying FL in Yr 10, 1998	Studs. **not** studying FL in Yr 10, 1998
Interesting	- Boring	81	82	82	69
Unprejudiced	- Prejudiced	55	61	58	61
Clean	- Dirty	86	76	82	78
Handsome	- Ugly	61	55	58	58
Colourful	- Colourless	83	69	75	72
Friendly	- Unfriendly	81	82	82	79
Honest	- Dishonest	80	79	80	77
Clever	- Stupid	79	81	92	77
Kind	- Cruel	76	81	81	72
Sophisticated	- Unsophisticated	80	79	80	75
Polite	- Impolite	83	79	80	78
Successful	- Unsuccessful	88	87	87	81
Reliable	- Unreliable	86	77	82	76
Hardworking	- Lazy	87	83	86	86
Civilised	- Uncivilised	88	85	86	83
Open	- Secretive	61	53	58	59
Overall		78.44	75.56	78.06	73.81

Table 5: Q7. Attitude to Australians
(Percentage of students giving positive ratings)

Positive to Negative Continuum		Students studying FL < 4 years	Students studying FL = or > 4 years	Students studying FL in Yr 10, 1998	Studs. **not** studying FL in Yr 10, 1998
Interesting	- Boring	85	85	86	91
Unprejudiced	- Prejudiced	29	34	32	35
Clean	- Dirty	89	87	89	86
Handsome	- Ugly	91	89	91	89
Colourful	- Colourless	88	91	90	89
Friendly	- Unfriendly	94	95	94	92
Honest	- Dishonest	83	79	81	78
Clever	- Stupid	70	77	74	72
Kind	- Cruel	87	78	88	88
Sophisticated	- Unsophisticated	73	77	76	72
Polite	- Impolite	78	83	81	82
Successful	- Unsuccessful	85	89	86	87
Reliable	- Unreliable	77	82	80	82
Hardworking	- Lazy	63	70	67	80
Civilised	- Uncivilised	90	96	92	89
Open	- Secretive	88	91	90	89
Overall		79.38	81.44	81.06	81.31

Table 6: Q8 (i). Attitude to Europeans
(Percentage of students giving positive ratings)

Positive to Negative Continuum		Students studying FL < 4 years	Students studying FL = or > 4 years	Students studying FL in Yr 10, 1998	Studs. **not** studying FL in Yr 10, 1998
Interesting	- Boring	87	90	89	89
Unprejudiced	- Prejudiced	38	39	38	42
Clean	- Dirty	85	75	85	91
Handsome	- Ugly	85	86	86	82
Colourful	- Colourless	77	76	66	86
Friendly	- Unfriendly	76	85	86	84
Honest	- Dishonest	84	84	84	84
Clever	- Stupid	73	76	75	71
Kind	- Cruel	81	83	82	85
Sophisticated	- Unsophisticated	87	88	88	84
Polite	- Impolite	80	87	84	90
Successful	- Unsuccessful	91	92	92	85
Reliable	- Unreliable	85	81	84	83
Hardworking	- Lazy	81	83	83	88
Civilised	- Uncivilised	91	90	90	86
Open	- Secretive	70	69	69	72
Overall		79.44	75.5	80.06	81.38

Table 7: Q8 (ii). Attitude to Asians
(Percentage of students giving positive ratings)

Positive to Negative Continuum		Students studying FL < 4 years	Students studying FL = or > 4 years	Students studying FL in Yr 10, 1998	Studs. **not** studying FL in Yr 10, 1998
Interesting	- Boring	68	65	67	67
Unprejudiced	- Prejudiced	52	48	50	49
Clean	- Dirty	65	59	62	58
Handsome	- Ugly	49	40	45	43
Colourful	- Colourless	64	62	62	65
Friendly	- Unfriendly	76	68	72	66
Honest	- Dishonest	73	65	68	65
Clever	- Stupid	84	78	81	80
Kind	- Cruel	76	73	74	65
Sophisticated	- Unsophisticated	71	68	69	72
Polite	- Impolite	76	70	73	68
Successful	- Unsuccessful	85	82	84	85
Reliable	- Unreliable	85	73	78	65
Hardworking	- Lazy	89	84	87	81
Civilised	- Uncivilised	83	79	80	78
Open	- Secretive	42	42	43	41
Overall		71.13	66	68.44	65.5

Table 8: Q8 (iii). Attitude to Australian Indigenous Persons
(Percentage of students giving positive ratings)

Positive to Negative Continuum		Students studying FL < 4 years	Students studying FL = or > 4 years	Students studying FL in Yr 10, 1998	Studs. **not** studying FL in Yr 10, 1998
Interesting	- Boring	71	69	70	77
Unprejudiced	- Prejudiced	48	40	42	38
Clean	- Dirty	42	42	42	46
Handsome	- Ugly	33	34	39	43
Colourful	- Colourless	68	69	79	70
Friendly	- Unfriendly	71	73	71	67
Honest	- Dishonest	56	61	59	61
Clever	- Stupid	50	48	49	52
Kind	- Cruel	67	71	69	73
Sophisticated	- Unsophisticated	35	32	34	39
Polite	- Impolite	55	61	58	60
Successful	- Unsuccessful	32	37	34	46
Reliable	- Unreliable	50	57	53	54
Hardworking	- Lazy	45	51	47	52
Civilised	- Uncivilised	43	48	45	48
Open	- Secretive	62	64	63	62
Overall		51.75	53.56	53.38	55.5

Table 9: Q9. Attitude to Language Teachers
(Percentage of students giving positive ratings)

Positive to Negative Continuum		Students studying FL < 4 years	Students studying FL = or > 4 years	Students studying FL in Yr 10, 1998	Studs. **not** studying FL in Yr 10, 1998
Interesting	- Boring	68	65	67	54
Unprejudiced	- Prejudiced	75	75	75	53
Clean	- Dirty	84	86	85	74
Handsome	- Ugly	60	45	52	40
Colourful	- Colourless	71	65	68	68
Friendly	- Unfriendly	83	75	79	68
Honest	- Dishonest	85	88	87	78
Clever	- Stupid	79	84	82	74
Kind	- Cruel	75	71	73	76
Sophisticated	- Unsophisticated	75	72	73	67
Polite	- Impolite	84	82	83	70
Successful	- Unsuccessful	77	73	76	83
Reliable	- Unreliable	80	72	78	72
Hardworking	- Lazy	85	77	81	77
Civilised	- Uncivilised	85	81	83	80
Open	- Secretive	75	70	73	60
Overall		77.56	73.81	75.94	68.38

Table 10: Q10. Attitude to Self
(Percentage of students giving positive ratings)

Positive to Negative Continuum		Students studying FL < 4 years	Students studying FL = or > 4 years	Students studying FL in Yr 10, 1998	Studs. **not** studying FL in Yr 10, 1998
Interesting	- Boring	91	85	87	89
Unprejudiced	- Prejudiced	64	71	68	65
Clean	- Dirty	97	96	97	96
Handsome	- Ugly	72	72	72	77
Colourful	- Colourless	90	85	88	89
Friendly	- Unfriendly	98	95	96	98
Honest	- Dishonest	91	93	92	94
Clever	- Stupid	88	78	72	85
Kind	- Cruel	93	94	93	97
Sophisticated	- Unsophisticated	89	94	85	88
Polite	- Impolite	96	83	95	94
Successful	- Unsuccessful	88	94	87	91
Reliable	- Unreliable	90	85	90	90
Hardworking	- Lazy	76	88	78	83
Civilised	- Uncivilised	98	80	96	97
Open	- Secretive	83	95	82	80
Overall		87.75	86.75	86.13	88.31

Perceptions of Classroom Practice: In Question 11, information was sought on **students' attitudes** towards ten aspects of teaching methods. Though the question was partly a distractor, it also provided useful information on what activities students value. It is informative to contrast their responses with those of the teachers, especially in the context of the central issue of cross-cultural attitude development.

There were 545 students who completed Question 11 with the response as shown in Table 11. It is probable, as noted earlier, that "No" and "No change" were treated as the same by many students.

Table 11: Q11. Percentage student response choices for classroom practice changes

If I had the opportunity to change the way language was taught in our school, I would:	*Yes*	*No*	*No change required*	Order of student priority for change
(a) spend more time reading and writing	25	25	50	10
(b) spend more time talking with native speakers of the language	69	16	15	2
(c) spend more time learning about the culture	59	20	21	4
(d) focus more on accuracy of pronunciation	39	24	37	6
(e) focus more on accuracy of grammar	38	28	34	7
(f) use the internet more to communicate with students in countries where the language is spoken	76	15	9	1
(g) play more language games	62	20	18	3
(h) listen to more songs in the language	36	41	23	8
(i) focus on language used in the job I want to do in the future	48	26	26	5
(j) use the language in studying other subjects in school	27	47	26	9

The following observations are noteworthy:

1. Three of the four items in which a majority of students sought change involve more active use of the language, the top two, which scored 76% and 69% respectively, involving interaction with native speakers through the internet and in talking with native speakers. Clearly students want their language classes to be more oriented towards real-life communication and contact with native speakers.

2. The fourth area in which a majority of students (59%) wanted to see increased attention was in the teaching of culture.

3. It is significant that those activities which the students most want to see increased are also those which, it is believed, are the ones most conducive to favourable

attitude development but which, we shall see subsequently, were also relatively low on the teachers' list of priorities.

4. Students seem not to want an increase in reading and writing, the two activities which traditionally have taken up most class time. However, as ambiguous as the "no – no change required" alternative might be, 50% of the students marked the amount of reading and writing as requiring "no change", suggesting that at least half of them believed the amount of reading and writing to be about right.

5. Though a majority of students (62%) want to have more opportunity to play language games, most (65%) do not want more songs in the language. Though it is difficult to interpret the reasons for this, in the context of the responses to Question 11 where there is a demand for more communicative activities involving native speakers, language games are probably seen as involving more active and realistic use of the language in contrast to the more formal activities which were rated lower. It is curious that most did not want to see more language songs since, traditionally, songs have been used a great deal in the foreign language classroom but it is probable that students do not see them as very conducive to increasing their communicative ability (on which they clearly place considerable value) and probably do not see them as important elements of the target culture which they also value. This may, of course, reflect students' adverse judgements on the generally trivial nature of the songs that language teachers have traditionally used with their classes.

6. Approximately two-thirds of the students did not want to see any increase in the more formal aspects of language teaching and did not want to see any greater focus being given to formal accuracy in pronunciation or grammar. Again, this matches with their preference for a focus on real-life communication activities.

7. In recent years there has been a great increase in the number of immersion programmes in Australian schools but the student responses here do not provide much support for this. Only about a quarter (27%) wanted to see an increase in the teaching of other subjects through the language. Even though such programmes increase the practical use made of the language, it seems that students probably see it as more school-based language use whereas what they are seeking is more real-life use of the language in interaction with native speakers.

8. In the same mood, a small majority of the students (52%) did not want to see an increase in the vocational emphasis in language teaching activities even though, in the long term, one might think that this would lead to more use of the language in interaction with native speakers. The students' focus seems to be more on social interaction. This observation is also of interest in the context of Australian language policy since, in recent years, there has been a greatly increased emphasis on the economic and vocational justification for teaching languages and it is commonly believed (and backed up by popular opinion surveys) that many parents, perhaps too many parents, want their children to learn a language because they believe it will help them get a job.

It is useful to compare these student observations about their language learning activities with the **teachers' responses** to their questionnaire (though these observations need to be

qualified by the fact that they are based on only 24 teachers). For the purposes of this paper, the focus will be on Questions 2, 3, 6 and 7 since Questions 4 and 5 are less immediately relevant to the issue of cross-cultural attitudes.

The teacher characteristics were provided earlier and in Table 2. In the second question, teachers were asked to prioritise some possible goals for language teaching. In fact, they found it very difficult to do so, some commenting that they were all important. In addition, only half the teachers gave a rating for *(f) Students will gain positive attitudes towards language learning in general* but those who did so rated it highly, providing a mean score of 9.6. The overall order of priority for the other goals is shown in Table 12.

Table 12: Q2. Teachers' Priorities for Selected Goals of Language Education

Order of Priority	Goals of Language Education	Mean
1	To communicate orally with native speakers using the LOTE.	7.6
2	To learn about the culture of native users of the LOTE.	7.2
3	To gain positive attitudes about native speakers of the LOTE.	7.1
4 4	To enable students to evaluate their own cultural preconceptions. To enable students to learn how to learn languages effectively.	7
6	To communicate orally with the teacher using the LOTE.	5.95
7 7	To communicate through writing in the LOTE. To read fluently in the LOTE.	5.5
9	To use the LOTE accurately across the four skills.	5

The ratings of the goals shown in Table 12 by the teachers would seem to be eminently appropriate in the light of modern views of language teaching, match the students' preferences, and accord with the weightings required if language teaching is to be effective in developing more positive cross-cultural attitudes. As noted subsequently and in the brief literature overview earlier, interaction with native speakers, a deep and personal cultural knowledge and understanding, and the chance to think about relevant attitudinal issues are probably the *sine qua non* of teaching aimed at effecting attitudinal change. The first two goals, if realised in appropriate activities, are appropriate to language teaching oriented towards more positive cross-cultural attitude development (the third goal). However, goals are probably the ideals that teachers might like to work towards but they do not necessarily reflect what teachers actually do in their daily classroom activities and, in fact, Table 13 suggests that the teachers do not place much emphasis in their teaching on their high priority goals and the lowest-valued goals are much more frequently realised in daily teaching/learning activities.

The preferred activities (whether one takes the two categories of "Very Often" and "Often" or add "Sometimes") are "communicative activities", "student to student conversation", and "directed tasks" followed by formal grammar learning activities ("grammar exercises" and "formal grammar teaching") (see Table 13). The last contrasts with the relatively low priority accorded the goal "to use the LOTE accurately across the four skills" in Table 12 (in fact, it was ranked last). Furthermore, apart from "communicative activities", "directed tasks" and "role plays", none of which are likely to allow for student initiatives or to involve interaction with native speakers, those activities that would give an opportunity to use the language for real student-initiated

Table 13: Q3. Percentage of Teachers by category of Frequency of Use of 22 Specified Teaching Activities

Teaching and Learning Activity	Very Often (VO)	Often (O)	Some-times (Stms)	Rarely	Never	O + VO	O + VO + Stms	Rank[6] O + VO	Rank[7] O+VO +Stms
Role Plays	21	29	41	8	0	50	91	6	5
Plays/Playlets	4	4	50	41	0	8	58		
Pronunc. Drills	4	37	29	26	4	41	70	8	
Jigsaw Rdg	4	4	34	40	8	8	42		
Student to student conversations	33	42	24	0	0	75	100	2	1
Projects about culture	0	12	53	22	13	12	65		
Translation exs.	4	40	34	18	4	44	78	7	8
Rote memorisation of vocabulary	16	16	34	30	4	32	66		
Story writing	0	22	50	12	16	22	72		10
Interaction with native speakers	16	21	42	21	0	37	79	10	7
Communicative activities	35	57	8	0	0	92	100	1	1
Grammar games	12	29	34	21	4	41	75	8	9
Formal grammar teaching	12	41	38	9	0	53	91	5	5
Grammar exercises	4	58	34	4	0	62	96	4	3
Directed tasks	14	55	27	4	0	69	96	3	3
Free reading	4	8	38	34	16	12	50		
Language evenings	4	18	0	35	43	22	22		
Language camps	0	4	9	17	70	4	13		
Language clubs	0	0	0	26	74	0	0		
Songs	4	12	50	30	4	16	66		
Activities using Internet	8	13	29	21	29	21	50		
Communication via email	0	4	22	26	48	4	26		

and informal communication and could readily be planned to involve and give opportunities for interaction with native speakers appear very low in the frequency of use report, in particular "interaction with native speakers", "language evenings", "language camps" and "language clubs" have frequencies of 22%, 4% and 0% for "Often" and "Very Often" and 22%, 13% and 0% if "Sometimes" is added. Electronic activities (internet and email), which facilitate interaction with native speakers even if there are none in the school's immediate community, also rank very low at 21% and 4% for "Often" and "Very Often" and 50% and 26% if "sometimes" is included. In other words, even though the teachers rank communication with native speakers high as a goal, they make little use of related teaching activities even though such interaction facilitates both language development and more positive cross-cultural attitudes. Again, as noted earlier, this limited use of activities involving interaction with native speakers, whether face-to-face or via the internet and email, contrasts starkly with the changes that students want to see in

[6] Ranks 1 to 10 only.
[7] Ranks 1 to 10 only.

their language programmes where these two activities (interaction with native speakers and use of the internet) were at the top of the student "wishlist". Specifically, 76% of students wanted more use of the internet (email) to communicate with native speakers but 74% of the teachers said that they used it "rarely" or "never". In terms of developing cultural understanding, only 12% of teachers said that they used "projects about culture" "often" and none "very often" and only 65% used them "sometimes" or "often"; yet cultural understanding is essential in the development of the meaning system of the language, cultural knowledge and understanding make important contributions to the development of cross-cultural understanding and positive attitudes, and some 59% of students called for more culture teaching (Table 11).

These observations are further supported by Table 14, summarising the teachers' responses to Question 6, which asked about the factors that influence the design of their courses. In particular, cross-cultural attitudes ranked 5 out of 7 in importance and "the contact students could have with the language outside of school time" (when interaction is more likely to occur and informal activities can be arranged to include it and to involve informal student-initiated use of the language) is ranked last out of the 7 factors.

The teachers' responses to the question on assessment (Question 4) are not reported here. They broadly back up the other comments here about the teachers' goals and methods though the results and their interpretation are considerably influenced by the distinctive school assessment requirements that exist in Queensland. One starkly evident point to note, however, is that "projects on cultural items/issues" ranked last in frequency of use of all the approaches listed with 65% of teachers saying that they "rarely or never" used them and confirming the observation already made that systematic culture teaching seems to be largely neglected.

Table 14: Q6. Importance Teachers attach to nine factors in Foreign Language Course Design

Order of Importance*	Factors in Foreign Language course design	Mean Score**
1	The interests of the students. The ability of the students.	5.2
2	The previous language learning experiences of the students. The set syllabus.	5
3	The everyday lives of the students.	4.7
4	Your own interests that you can share with students.	4.6
5	The attitudes of the students to native speakers of the LOTE.	4.2
6	The reasons why the students have chosen the particular LOTE.	3.9
7	The contact the students have or could have with the LOTE outside class/school time.	3.8

* 1 is most important

** Rated from "extremely important" (6) to "not at all important" (1).

One might surmise that the reason for teachers' placing most emphasis on the formal and controlled activities and least on the informal activities, especially involving interaction face-to-face or via the internet with native speakers, is that they do not believe that Year

10 students have sufficient proficiency to cope with such activities. Question 7 asked the teachers to rate an "average" Year 10 student on the four macroskills. The results are shown in Table 15.

All but one or two teachers say that the average Year 10 stude[illegible]s at ISLPR 1 or 2. At ISLPR 1, they are capable of holding simple face-to-face con[illegible]ions at ISLPR 1 but produce and understand more complex utterances and personal opinions at ISLPR 2. Clearly, if the teachers' proficiency ratings are accurate, the students would be capable of holding conversations with native speakers, even if at a fairly simple level, and so student proficiency is not the reason for the teachers' failure to provide interactive activities. However, one has to question whether all the ratings were accurate since, as Table 15 shows, the teachers estimate more or less the same attainment levels in all four macroskills even though about half of the students were in Japanese and Chinese classes and attainment in reading and writing is most unlikely to be as high as is specified nor to be the same as for Speaking and Listening.

Table 15: Q7. Teacher ratings of the Proficiency of Year 10 students

Proficiency Level		Macroskills	
Ques. Scale	(ISLPR)	**Speaking**	**Reading**
5	(3)		1
4	(2)	10	11
3	(1)	11	6
2	(0+)	1	2
1	(0)	0	
Range 2 to 4 on Ques. Scale		1	1
		Listening	**Writing**
5	(3)	1	
4	(2)	9	9
3	(1)	11	11
2	(0+)	0	1
1	(0)		
Range 2 to 4 on Ques. scale		1	1

(The figures show the number of teacher ratings at each proficiency level. There were 24 teachers in the survey though only 21 or 22 responded to this question.)

In brief, the priorities teachers accord in their choice of teaching activities, match ill with their stated preferred goals, match ill with the students' desire for change in their language programmes, and match ill with what is known about the development of more favourable cross-cultural attitudes. In such circumstances, it is not surprising that (as noted earlier) such large numbers of students drop out before Year 10 and that there is little evidence of a significant relationship between learning another language and more positive cross-cultural attitudes.

V DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The study reported in this paper has a number of important limitations: first, it is based around a single survey rather than being longitudinal (which makes it more difficult to identify cause-effect relationships); second, an intense public debate, which at least superficially was about cross-cultural attitudes and racism, was proceeding at the very time when student attitudes were being surveyed and constituted a strongly dominant background variable; and, third, since only 9 out of 593 students had never experienced foreign language teaching, it was not possible to compare the attitudes of those who had learned a language with those who had not. In addition, because the project was not longitudinal and all the teachers were following the same syllabus, it was not possible to contrast different teaching methods and relate them to differential attitudinal effects. Nevertheless, there are a number of observations that can be made and implications drawn for language teaching from the study especially when it is taken in the context of the other research referred to in the literature.

1. The study was intended as a pilot leading into a major longitudinal study and it raises a number of issues worth pursuing in ***subsequent research***:

    - Not least, it will be interesting for social, political and educational reasons, especially in the Australian context, to see, now that the "One Nation" issue and the immigration debate have faded practically into insignificance, whether students' cross-cultural attitudes have changed and whether background variables continue to overwhelm any possible attitudinal effects of language learning.

    - A longitudinal study may provide time for more sophisticated attitude elicitation procedures to be used so as to more precisely differentiate student attitudes and their causes.

    - In a larger-scale study covering more schools, it may be possible to include a larger number of students who have not studied a language and compare their attitudes with the possibly changing attitudes of students in long-term language programmes.

    - In a longitudinal study involving a larger number of schools in different States and following different language syllabuses, it may be possible to identify different teaching styles and methods or structure the study so that different schools or teachers use contrasting methods including features such as native speaker interaction and "cerebration", which the literature suggests can be influential in determining attitudinal change. It is essential, as the recommendations of the Melbourne Linguapax conference in 1995 stated, that much more empirical research, especially in longitudinal classroom-based studies, be undertaken aimed at assessing the effect of different methodological approaches on cross-cultural attitudes and aimed at developing methods that more effectively and decisively foster positive student attitudes [cf. Cunningham and Candelier 1995: 14]

2. As uncertain as the effect of language teaching on cross-cultural attitudes might be, in societies characterised by cultural and racial diversity such as in Australia and in all

countries in the context of inevitable and increasing globalisation, it is vital, as those parts of the world torn apart by such atrocities as "ethnic cleansing" and intercultural warfare tragically demonstrate, for ***education*** systems to consider their ***role*** and to do all they can to fit each generation for life in a multicultural and increasingly global society. Not least, it is essential that language teaching, the element of the curriculum most immediately concerned with cross-cultural communication, to consider its goals and methods and ensure that they are as compatible as possible with this urgent need.

3. It is probable that such intervention by education in an attempt to foster more positive cross-cultural attitudes will be more effective if it occurs before attitudes become less malleable with the stabilisation of personality through adolescence and, hence, it is desirable that ***foreign language teaching*** commence early ***in Primary School*** and that it envisage from the start in both its goals and its methods the development of positive cross-cultural attitudes.

4. The study itself seemed to have considerable (but differing) ***effects on*** many of the ***teachers,*** effects which individual teachers reported to the researchers at subsequent conferences and other meeting-places. For some teachers, it seemed to be the first time that they had thought significantly about such issues and their place in language teaching, they picked up on them, thought about them and discussed them with their students – it was "cerebration" starting to emerge in their teaching. For others, such personally, socially and politically sensitive issues were difficult to handle, they retreated from them, and focussed on the "easier" and more objective issues such as the teaching of grammar and other aspects of proficiency development. Clearly both these unexpected outcomes raise important issues for language teacher education.

5. If language teaching is to take up the challenge of trying to influence students' cross-cultural attitudes to enable them to cope more adequately and harmoniously with the increasing multiculturalism of many societies and with the demands arising from globalisation, there are important implications for ***teacher education***: teachers will need to be trained to realise such goals through their methodology. As Mantle-Bromley found in her study and as is, in any case, well known to all educationalists, if teachers are not competent in classroom management and methodology, the extent of curricular success or the probability of achieving specified goals, is greatly reduced [cf. Mantle-Bromley 1995: 378 – 379]. Teachers need also to be sensitive to issues of cultural and racial difference and be able to demonstrate to their students the sort of positive cross-cultural attitudes that they are, ideally, seeking to develop in their students. Not least, they will need to be trained, not only to adopt appropriate teaching methods, but also to be able to handle the essential counselling role that is required as part of the "cerebration" process in which students are led to identify their own and others' cross-cultural attitudes, their causes and the intuitive reactions and behaviours that manifest them; teachers need to be trained to lead their students to reflect upon these issues, to help their students subject their ideas and reactions to rational processes, and, hopefully, to help them to modify their ideas and reactions in a positive direction. Such tasks are not easy for teachers who are themselves caught up in the same social and political situations as their students and teacher education programmes need to be designed to develop the necessary skills and understanding. Not least, it is essential that language teachers themselves manifest the sorts of cross-cultural attitudes implicit in this study as essential goals for language teaching in the context of multicultural societies and globalisation.

A necessary starting-point if teacher education programmes are to take on these tasks is to specify the sorts of skills and attitudes, or "competencies", that language teachers require [cf. Australian Language and Literacy Council 1996: Chapter 5]. A project undertaken by the Centre for Applied Linguistics and Languages in 1994-95 drew up a set of language teacher competencies in two broad areas of language skills and professional competencies. The project report is in two parts: the first provides a specific purpose language proficiency scale for use with language teachers, essentially a special purpose version of the ISLPR [Wylie and Ingram 1995]. Obviously the issue of teacher proficiency is important since, if the teachers' proficiency levels are low, they are likely to be reluctant to involve their students in activities (such as interaction with native speakers) that they may, themselves, feel unable to cope with. Of more immediate relevance to the present paper is the second volume of the report [Commins 1995] which identifies the professional skills that teachers require and, in particular, identifies cross-cultural attitudes that teachers should show and the teaching skills they require to enable them to develop appropriate attitudes in their students. Here, only brief excerpts pertinent to the present topic will be discussed.

Commins [1995: 36 – 90] identifies five broad "Areas of Competence" required by language teachers:

1. *Using and developing professional knowledge and values*
2. *Communicating, interacting and working with students and others*
3. *Planning and managing the teaching and learning process*
4. *Monitoring and assessing student progress and learning outcomes*, and,
5. *Reflecting, evaluating and planning for continuous improvement.*

These areas of competence are then sub–divided into various elements and "cues" but here we shall consider only the ones pertinent to cross–cultural attitudes.

Two of the elements of *Using and developing professional knowledge and values* are of particular relevance and are shown in Table 16.

The fifth element of Area of Competence 1 is *Goals of LOTE Learning*, described as *The teacher has some appreciation of the wider educational goals of LOTE learning.* Within that, a core cue requires the teacher to *understand how LOTE learning involves and develops cross–cultural communication* while, within the specific Primary/Secondary component, there is reference to appreciating *the contribution of LOTE learning to a culturally inclusive curriculum* [Commins 1995: 39].

The ninth element of Area of Competence 1 is *Ethical and Legal Requirements* described as *The teacher operates from an appropriate ethical position and within the framework of law and regulation affecting teachers' work.* Within the Core, there are specified, amongst other "cues", the following three:

* *acknowledges social and cultural values of students which may affect expectations of language learning*

* *avoids and discourages discrimination on the basis of gender, race and religion*

* *values and takes account of the gender, cultural and linguistic backgrounds of students in the language learning process* [Commins 1995: 41]

Table 16: Extract from *Minimum Skills and Competencies Needed by LOTE Teachers*: Area of Competence 1: Using and Developing Professional Knowledge and Values, Elements iii and iv

ELEMENT	CUES
(iii) CROSS–CULTURAL VALUES ***Verbal Description:*** **The teacher models and encourages favourable cross–cultural attitudes and behaviours**	**CORE** * demonstrates respect for cultural and linguistic differences * understands the importance of being aware of own and students' ethnocentric and/or stereotypic attitudes * creates opportunities for students to extend their world view and gain new cultural perspectives **VOCATIONAL** * identifies areas in the specific vocational context that require sensitivity and tolerance
(iv) CULTURAL UNDER–STANDINGS ***Verbal Description:*** **The teacher displays sensitivity to and some knowledge of a culture(s) associated with the LOTE and understands how the values and world view are expressed through the language.**	**CORE** * has specific knowledge of customs and aspects of contemporary life in a culture of the LOTE which are of interest and relevance to the age level of the students * draws students' attention to socially significant aspects of culture (such as values, codes of behaviour, assumptions) as they occur visually or in texts in the target language * has some knowledge of the history, geography, and political context of a country of the target language * appreciates the contribution of the target cultural group or society to Australian society and/or to the world community

[Commins 1995: 38]

Area of Competence 2 is *Communicating, Interacting and Working with Students and Others* and, in that, Element 5, *Developing Professional and Community Contacts*, is described in terms that are clearly relevant to the notion of "community involvement" as a key component of language teaching aimed at fostering favourable cross-cultural understanding:

> *The teacher values communication with school or institution support staff, the profession and with the wider community, including the LOTE speaking community.* [Commins 1995: 44]

The core "cues" indicate that the teacher will *value the input of native speaking visitors and/or teaching assistants* and also that he or she will *value and, where possible, facilitate contacts with speakers of the target language in Australia and abroad.* [Commins 1995: 44]

Area of Competence 3 relates to *Planning and Managing the Teaching and Learning Process.* One element makes specific reference to planning tasks that are relevant to the students (including their cultural backgrounds) and the third, *Implementing Language programs*, includes as Core "cues" the requirement that the teacher

> *makes learning relevant by:*
> *– drawing on local resources and people where available*
> *– incorporating local events and current concerns into lessons where appropriate.* [Commins 1995: 47]

In brief, then, the minimum competency specifications proposed and supported by the wide cross-section of the language teaching profession in Australia consulted during the development process include specific reference to the teacher's own cross-cultural attitudes, to the teacher's knowing how to foster more favourable cross-cultural attitudes in learners, and to the use of what has been referred to in this paper as "community involvement" activities.

6. In language teaching designed to effect positive influence on cross-cultural attitudes, it seems probable that a number of aspects of ***methodology*** are important though it has to be conceded that the literature is not wholly convincing and further research is required. Wilkins' conclusions in 1987 remain pertinent:

> *A more complete theory of language, taken with theories of learning and of social behaviour would show that if the potential benefits of bilingualism are to become available to the individual language learner, it will only be through a language learning experience that has a strong communicative orientation. Only if the learner is attempting to communicate and to understand communication in the language is he forced into the situation of having to adopt new patterns of behaviour associated with new cultural perceptions. If the learning experience is simply the assimilation of linguistic knowledge or the manipulation of formal patterns, it will almost certainly fall short of creating the conditions which will favour the development of flexibility in cognitive operations and in appreciation of*

> *others and their cultures. Far from being in conflict with wider educational aims, it seems highly probable that communicative language teaching is necessary to their attainment. ...*
>
> *Little is known about the effects on the individual of different learning activities and the capacities of the learner in such domains as cognition, memory, and personality. It would be immensely valuable to know exactly what the psychological implications would be for the learner of our adopting specific procedures in language teaching.* [Wilkins 1987: 32 – 33]

Issues of methodology have been elaborated in earlier papers [e.g., Ingram 1978, 1980b, 1980c, 1995] but the evidence points to the probability that the following principles are pertinent and warrant further investigation and elaboration:

- First, interaction or "community involvement" should be the basic foundation on which language teaching operates; that is, as the central learning activity, learners must be given continual opportunities, both formal and informal, face-to-face and over the internet, to interact with speakers of the target language and to use the target language for real communicative purposes and hence for the purposes of normal social interaction. "Community involvement" is not only intended to practise the language but also enables learners to experience the other culture at an individual level and to start to perceive through personal experience the universality of human needs, emotions and interests that permeate the diversity of cultural expressions [see especially Ingram 1980, 1980b and 1980c where the forms of "community involvement" are elaborated and illustrated]. It is relevant to note the recommendation of the final report of the Council of Europe's modern languages project *Language Learning for European Citizenship*:

  > *…every school in Europe should be linked to schools in other member States in a multilateral interaction network, (where possible in association with town-twinning arrangements). Schools should use all available media and channels of communication in order to engage in continuing information exchange, discussion, etc., so as to provide a basis for pupil and teacher visits and exchanges. Networks should not operate simply through one single language of international currency, but plurilingually, developing mutual comprehension through the use of all languages represented in the network.* [Trim 1997: 62]

- Second, learners need the opportunity to develop profound cultural knowledge and understanding, not just of the gimmickry of other cultures but of the personal culture that governs the daily lives of the speakers of the target language. For this to occur, the target culture must be taught both as an integral part of the language and systematically so that the inherent logic and rationality of the culture is evident. For this, it is useful to find a systematic path into the culture as may be provided by teaching some other subject (e.g., social studies, music or other school disciplines) through the target language whether as one component of a regular language course or in a partial or full immersion programme. In particular, it is through

interaction with native speakers that learners come to realise the individuality that exists within the universality of a culture and can come to perceive the essence of the culture rather than just be amused by what may otherwise be seen as the gimmickry (the jingly songs and monuments or superficial eating habits that too often form the essential stuff of cultural elements of foreign language teaching programmes).

- Third, not least so as to realise the almost adventitious nature of cultural systems (as well as for reasons related to the nature of language learning and semantic development itself), learners need the opportunity to re-conceptualise their experience. Hence, in addition to learning about the target culture and the country of origin of that language, learners should be encouraged (both in the course of interaction with native speakers in the students' own community, in exchanges with native speakers in the target country or over the internet, and in more formal activities) to talk and write about their own environment and their own everyday experiences and, in particular, to discuss them with native speakers of the target language, and thus to re-experience in the target language the things they have experienced and learned through their first language and in their own first culture. [Again this issue is elaborated and illustrated in Ingram 1978, 1980b, and 1980c; see also Morgan 1993].

- Fourth, what has been called "cerebration" forms a vital component of educational programmes intended to generate positive cross-cultural attitudes since it is through this process that learners are better able to apply their own rational processes to understanding and modifying their own entrenched attitudes and intuitive responses. This is especially appropriate to language teaching because it is that element of the curriculum most immediately involved with cross-cultural communication and because interaction or "community involvement", if it is included as a part of the language teaching programme, is likely to stimulate minor or major "culture shock" responses that bring out for discussion and rational examination the students' learned or intuitive responses to cultural differences in the one-to-one encounters with the speakers of the other language that "community involvement" provides. In addition, in the controlled situation provided by a language programme, a properly trained teacher is able to manage the discussion and the students' encounters with their own reactions and attitudes and is well placed to help students avoid the retreat into egocentric shells (which can be one of the reactions to culture shock) and to guide the students' "cerebration" process. [For further elaboration on this, see Ingram 1978, 1980b, 1980c; see also Mantle-Bromley 1995, Triandis 1971]

VI CONCLUSION

The study in this paper, especially when considered with the broad trend found in the literature, and the enigma that the study and the literature present have salutary lessons for all those language policy-makers, syllabus writers and language teachers who believe, undoubtedly like most of us, that language teaching is the element of the curriculum that is

best able to effect positive cross-cultural attitude change in students. Language teaching does not automatically achieve such effects and, even at best, will not do so without significant attention to methodology. After all, if language teaching is little more than the presentation and manipulation of rules and verbal symbols, there is no reason to believe that it will be any more successful in changing cross-cultural attitudes than is algebra; if the prime focus of language teaching is on the manipulation of words to carry out tasks unrelated to real-life communication need between people, there is no reason to believe that language teaching should be any more effective in changing attitudes than is cryptography. The survey in this paper and the many studies in the literature suggest that language teaching will not automatically have positive effects on cross-cultural attitudes either towards the target culture group or more generally towards other cultures and races and, in fact, in some circumstances, it can demonstrably have a negative effect. If language teaching is to play an effective role in generating more positive cross-cultural attitudes conducive to life in multicultural societies and in the global village, it must be structured specifically to do so, incorporating in the normal methods applied in language classrooms those activities that, on the best evidence available, are most conducive to effecting positive cross-cultural attitude change. Such activities are not, in fact, contrary to those needed to maximise proficiency development, the language teachers' traditional principal goal, but are in fact identical to the best of them. In particular, appropriate activities include effective and progressive communicative language teaching [cf. Wilkins 1987: 32], interaction with native speakers, thorough knowledge and understanding of the target culture (not the pseudo culture of gimmicky songs and stone monuments) but the culture of the people, their way of thinking, feeling and viewing the world, a culture that learners can best sense as they interact with native speakers both face-to-face and through modern technology. In addition, the teacher has to be aware that interaction may lead to more positive or more negative attitudes, that some form of culture shock (which it is part of the teacher's role to help the students to manage) is an integral part of attitude development, and that learners need the opportunity to engage in "cerebration", to think about the issues of cultural and racial relations, to monitor their own learned or intuitive reactions in the face of cultural difference, to understand those reactions and the reactions of others, and, when necessary, to subject their own intuitive responses to reasoning and correction.

Language teaching, language learning and bilingualism do not inevitably produce more positive cross-cultural attitudes or else wars would not take place in the Balkans, Northern Ireland, and elsewhere and elections would not be won and lost on immigration and racial issues in countries like Australia. If an education system wishes to ensure that the unique advantages of language teaching in fostering more positive cross-cultural attitudes conducive to life in multicultural societies and conducive to a successful life in the global society are realised, then it must ensure that language teachers understand how their teaching activities can best be structured to have a positive effect on their students' cross-cultural attitudes. Finally, the diversity of results that have come from studies of the relationship between language teaching and cross-cultural attitudes suggests that that relationship and the factors that determine it are far from being fully understood and much more research is required, not least focussing on longitudinal studies observing attitude change over courses of several years' duration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, Gerry. 1994. "Language Rights and Duties in our Education Systems". In *FIPLV World News*, June, 1994:1-3.

Afendras, E. A. 1980. *Patterns of Bilingualism.* RELC Anthology Series, No 8. Singapore: RELC/University of Singapore.

Australian Language and Literacy Council. 1996. *Language Teachers: The Pivot of Policy.* Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Bartley, D. E. 1969. "A pilot study of aptitude and attitude factors in language dropout". In *California Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 20: 48 – 55.

Bartley, D. E. 1970. "The importance of the attitude factor in language dropout: a preliminary investigation of group and sex differences". In *Foreign Language Annals*, Vol. 3: 383 – 93.

Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, Queensland. 1995. *French Senior Syllabus.* Brisbane: Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, Queensland.

Bochner, Stephen. (ed.). 1983. *Cultures in Contact.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Bricknell, Paul and R. Hunter. (eds.). 1980. *Education : Planning and Process in Plural Societies.* Brisbane: Mt Gravatt CAE.

Buttjes, Dieter. 1991. "Mediating languages and cultures: the social and intercultural dimension restored" in Buttjes and Byram 1991.

Buttjes, Dieter and Byram, Michael. (eds.). 1991. *Mediating Languages and Cultures: Towards an Intercultural Theory of Foreign Language Education.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, Michael. 1991. "Teaching culture and language: towards an integrated model". In Buttjes and Byram 1991.

Byram, Michael and Veronica Esarte-Sarries. 1991. *Investigating Cultural Studies in Foreign Language Teaching: A Book for Teachers.* Clevedon, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Byram, Michael, Veronica Esarte-Sarries and Susan Taylor. 1991. *Cultural Studies and Language Learning: A Research Report.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Byram, Michael, Veronica Esarte-Sarries, Susan Taylor and Patricia Allatt. 1991. "Young peoples' perceptions of other cultures: the role of foreign language teaching". In Buttjes and Byram 1991.

Clement, R., Gardner, R.C., and Smythe, P.C. 1977. "Inter-ethnic contact: attitudinal consequences." In *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 1977.

Council of Australian Governments Working Group (COAG). 1994. *Asian Languages and Australia's Economic Future – A Report for the Council of Australian Governments on a Proposed National Asian Languages/Studies Strategy for Australian Schools.*

Commins, L. 1995. *Minimum Skills/Competencies needed by LOTE Teachers, Part Two: Professional Skills/Competencies*. Brisbane: Centre for Applied Linguistics and Languages and (NLLIA) Language Testing and Curriculum Centre, Griffith University.

Conférence suisse des directeurs cantonaux de l'instruction publique. 1998. *Quelles langues apprendre en Suisse pendant la scolarité obligatoire? Rapport d'un groupe d'experts mandaté par la Commission Formation Générale pour élaborer un "Concept Général pour l'Enseignement des Langues"*. Berne, Switzerland: Conférence suisse des directeurs cantonaux de l'instruction publique. (mimeograph)

Cunningham, Denis and Michel Candelier. 1995. *Linguapax V, Melbourne, Australia, June 30 - July 2 1995*. Melbourne: FIPLV and AFMLTA.

Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET). 1991. *Australia's Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET). 1991a. *Australia's Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy – Companion Volume to the Policy Paper*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Ehrman, Madeline E. 1993. "Ego boundaries revisited: toward a model of personality and learning". In *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics 1993.*

Etzioni, A.. 1994. "Schools and the Subject of Character". In *The Washington Post Education Review*, 3 April, 1994: 1, 36-37.

European Centre for Modern Languages. 1998. "Item 8.2 of the Preliminary Annotated Draft Agenda … Key Questions of Language Learning". Graz: European Centre for Modern Languages. (mimeograph)

Gardner, R. C. 1985. *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The Role of Attitudes and Motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. 1985a. *The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery: Technical Report*. Ontario: University of Western Ontario.

Gardner, R. C. and W. E. Lambert. 1972. *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Gardner, R. C. and P. D. McIntyre. 1993. "On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning". In *Language Learning*, Vol. 43, No. 2, June 1993: 157-194.

Gardner, R. C. and P. C. Smythe. 1975. "Second language acquisition: a social psychological approach". Research Bulletin No. 332, Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.

Gardner, R. C. and P. C. Smythe. 1975a. "Motivation and second language acquisition". In *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, Vol. 31: 218 – 230.

Genesee, F. 1983. "Bilingual education of majority-language children: the immersion experiment in review". In *Applied Psycholinguistics*, No. 4, 1983.

Harris, Jennifer & Ian Millbank. 1996. *MLTASA Special Edition Newsletter: Languages and the World of Work*, December 1996.

Horwitz, E. K. and M. B. Horwitz. 1977. "Bridging individual differences: empathy and communicative competence". In Schultz 1977: Chapter 12.

Ingram, D. E. 1996. "The Challenges to Language Education from the World of Work: To Achieve Cosmopolitan Excellence or become the White Trash of Asia". Plenary paper to the conference of the Modern Language Teachers Association of South Australia, *Languages and the World of Work*, Adelaide, 21 November, 1996. Reprinted in Harris and Millbank 1996: 3 - 19.

Ingram, D. E. 1995. "Improving inter-cultural attitudes and equity as language teaching aims". Invited paper to the UNESCO-FIPLV Linguapax V Workshop, Melbourne, Australia, 1 - 2 July, 1995. Reprinted in Cunningham and Candelier 1995: 23 - 38.

Ingram, D.E. 1994. "Languages in Primary School Education: towards equity for Australia and Australians". Keynote paper to 1994 Biennial National Languages Conference of the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations, *Equity in Languages other than English*, 1-4 October, 1994, Perth, Western Australia. Reprinted in Scarino 1996: 14 – 25.

Ingram, D. E. 1992. "Primary School Language Teaching: An Overview on Reasons, Policies and Implementation". Plenary paper to the AFMLTA National Workshop on Languages in the Primary School, *Two-Way Talk: Languages in the Primary School* , Adelaide, 25-27 September, 1992. Reprinted in *Babel*, Vol 28, No. 2, August 1993, pp. 8-21, 51.

Ingram, D. E. 1992a. "Excellence in Teachers". Plenary paper to the Ninth National Languages Conference of the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations, *Towards Language Excellence in the 21st Century*, Darwin, 6 – 9 July, 1992. Reprinted in Papapavlou and Wait 1992: 1 – 15.

Ingram, D. E. 1980 "Developing a Community Involvement Approach for Teaching ESL to Migrants". In *RELC Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 1, June 1980, pp. 14-34.

Ingram, D. E. 1980a. "Pluralism and Education : A Linguistic Approach". In Bricknell and Hunter 1980: 49-87.

Ingram, D. E. 1980b. "Aspects of Personality Development for Bilingualism". In Afendras 1980.

Ingram, D. E. 1980c. "To See, To Speak : Participate! Community Involvement in Language Teaching". In *Unicorn*, Vol. 6, No. 3, August 1980, pp. 276-283.

Ingram, D. E. 1978. *An Applied Linguistic Study of Advanced Language Learning*. Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Essex, Colchester, England.

Ingram, D. E. 1977. "Language Teaching in the Pluralist Society - The Challenge for Teacher Educators" in *Babel*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 1977, pp. 9-18.

Ingram, D. E. 1977a. "The Professional Education of Australian Language Teachers". In *The South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 5, No. 3, 1977, pp. 182-190.

Ingram, D. E. and Elaine Wylie. 1979. *International Second Language Proficiency Ratings (ASLPR)*. mimeograph. Subsequent editions dated 1984, 1985, and 1995. (Formerly known as the Australian Second Language Proficiency Ratings)

Jaspers, Jos and Miles Hewstone. 1983. "Cross-cultural interaction, social attribution and inter-group relations". In Bochner 1983.

Jayasuriya, Laksiri. 1994. "The political foundations of our pluralist society". In *Ethnic Spotlight*, No 33, July 1994: 12-14.

Jayasuriya, Laksiri. 1994. "The political foundations of our pluralist society". In *Ethnic Spotlight*, No 33, July 1994: 12-14.

Jones, Carolyn. 1996. "Religion studies fail to end bias". In *The Australian*, 17 April, 1996.

Kordes, Hagen. 1991. "Intercultural learning at school: limits and possibilities". In Buttjes and Byram 1991.

Kramsch, C. 1993. "Foreign languages for a global age". In *ADFL Bulletin*, Vol. 25: 1, 5 – 12.

Lo Bianco, Joseph. 1987. *National Policy on Languages*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Mantle-Bromley, Corinne and Raymond B. Miller. 1991. "Effect of multicultural lessons on attitudes of students of Spanish". In *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 75, No. iv, 1991: 418 – 425.

Mantle-Bromley, Corinne. 1995. "Positive attitudes and realistic beliefs: Links to proficiency". In *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 79, No. iii, 1995: 372 – 386.

Morgan, Carol. 1993. "Attitude change and foreign language culture learning". In *Language Teaching*, Vol. 26, April 1993: 63 – 75.

Ortuno, Marian Mikaylo. 1991. "Cross-Cultural Awareness in the Foreign Language Class: The Kluckhohn Model". In *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 75, No. iv, 1991: 449-459.

Oxford, Rebecca L. and Madeline Ehrman. 1993. "Second language research on individual differences". In *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 1993*, Vol 13: 188 – 205.

Papapavlou, Antonios and Anne Wait. 1992. *Towards Language Excellence in the 21st Century, Report of the Ninth National Languages Conference of the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations, Darwin, 6 – 9 July, 1992.* Darwin: Office of Multicultural Affairs and Office of Sport, Recreation and Ethnic Affairs.

Riestra, M. A. and C. E. Johnson. 1964. "Changes in attitudes of elementary school school pupils towards foreign-speaking peoples resulting from the study of a foreign language". In *Journal of Experimental Education*, Vol. 33: 65 – 72.

Scarino, Angela. (ed.). 1996. *Equity in Languages other than English.* Perth: Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations and Modern Language Teachers Association of Western Australia.

Schultz, Renate A. (ed.). 1977. Personalizing Foreign Language Instruction: Learning Styles and Teaching Options. Edited by Renate A. Schultz, Skokie, Illinois: National Textbook Company, pp 109-117.

Secretary of State for Education and Science and the Secretary of State for Wales. 1990. *Modern Foreign Languages for Ages 11 to 16: Proposals.* London: Department of Education and Science.

Triandis, Harry C. 1971. *Attitude and Attitude Change.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Trim, J. L. M. (ed. and compiler).1997. *Language Learning for European Citizenship – Final Report of the Project Group (1992 – 96).* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Trim, J. L. M. 1997a. *Modern Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment – A Common European Framework of Reference: A General Guide for Learners, Draft 1.* Strasbourg : Council for Cultural Cooperation.

Wilkins, David. 1987. *The Educational value of Foreign Language Learning - Council of Europe Project No. 12: "Learning and Teaching Modern Languages for Communication".* Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Cooperation.

Wylie, Elaine and D. E. Ingram. 1995. *Minimum Skills/Competencies needed by LOTE Teachers, Part One: Language Proficiency*. Brisbane: (NLLIA) Language Testing and Curriculum Centre/Centre for Applied Linguistics and Languages, Griffith University.

dei:dei:RELC 1999 Paper A:Cross-Cultural Attitudes Project Disk 3:18499

c:Papers:RELC 1999 Paper A:18499